

Articles

INSTITUTIONAL AND INDIVIDUAL PUBLICATION PRODUCTIVITY IN SELECTED ADULT EDUCATION JOURNALS, 1993-2002

John R. Rachal and William W. V. David

University of Southern Mississippi

Abstract

Examining institutional and individual publication productivity in scholarly journals is a commonly used index of institutional quality, influence, and prestige within a discipline. Expanding and extending the work of Rachal and Sargent (1995b), the present study surveyed the Commission of Professors of Adult Education for research journal preferences and examined the resulting five research journals from 1993-2002 for 10-year institutional productivity, institutional productivity by 5-year breakout, institutional productivity in each journal, individual author productivity, and single versus multiple authorship patterns by gender and by journal. Results yielded 65 per cent single authorship among 806 articles written by 1214 cumulative authors in two British, two American, and one Canadian journal. Institutions from four different countries emerged in the top 10 as the most productive for the 10-year period.

Résumé

L'examen de la productivité institutionnelle et individuelle en publication universitaire constitue l'une des façons les plus communément utilisées pour mesurer le degré d'expertise, d'influence et de prestige d'une institution dans une discipline donnée. En poursuivant et élargissant le travail amorcé par Rachal et Sargent (1995b), la présente étude a effectué un sondage auprès des membres de la CPAE (Commission of Professors of Adult Education) en vue de retenir cinq revues universitaires, qui ont été examinées de 1993 à 2002, afin de mesurer la productivité institutionnelle sur une période de dix ans et par tranche de cinq ans, la productivité individuelle et le nombre d'articles collectifs par rapport au nombre d'articles à auteur unique par genre et par revue

*The Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education/
La Revue canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes
19,1 May/mai 2005 1-20*

ISSN 0835-4944 © Canadian Association for the Study of Adult Education/
L'Association canadienne pour l'étude de l'éducation des adultes

2 Rachal and David, "Insitutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

universitaire. La recherche a démontré que 65 pourcent des 806 articles avaient été écrits par un seul auteur, qu'un total de 1214 auteurs ont écrits dans deux revues universitaires britanniques, deux revues américaines et une revue canadienne. Les dix institutions les plus productives sur une période de dix ans proviennent de quatre différents pays.

Going back as many as 4 decades, numerous authors in various fields have examined publication productivity as a means of assessing the collective contributions of institutions to the knowledge base of a given field. It is an almost ineluctable step from valuing research and its publication to valuing the frequency of its publication, followed by one more step to measuring that frequency. The rationale for the interest specifically in journal publication productivity studies is that they provide at least one measure of program quality, albeit one guarded by such caveats as the tendency of such studies to favor larger programs, the potentially distorting effect of a single prolific author, and the critical recognition that such studies ignore not only other journals, but other important publishing formats such as books. The fact that the refereed journal holds a special place in the development of an academic field's thought, representing its most current research, some of its most provocative thinking, and critical assessment of its established paradigms, has led to several examinations of publication productivity in a variety of fields. Rachal and Sargent (1995b) cite studies conducted in law (Ellman, 1983), reading (Hopkins, 1979; Johns, 1983); and in particular psychology (Cox & Catt, 1977; Howard, 1983; Howard, Cole, & Maxwell, 1987; Howard, Maxwell, Berra, & Sternitzke, 1985; Reynolds & Clark, 1984; and Webster, Hall, & Bolen, 1993).

More recently, publication productivity has been enlisted as a means of examining its relationship to gender of faculty (Liddle & Westergren, 1997), patterns of publication (Teodorescu, 2000), and comparison of clinical versus counseling psychologists (Brems & Johnson, 1996). Publication productivity has even entered the popular press, with coverage in the *Chronicle of Higher Education* (1998) on a report by the Education Resource Clearinghouse entitled "Assessing Faculty Publication Productivity: Issues of Equity." The number of publication productivity studies has resulted in some fields developing not merely a short-term snapshot but a fairly long time frame of productivity within a field. For example Henthorne, LaTour, and Loraas (1998) examine the concept in the field of advertising, extending the work of an earlier researcher (Barry, 1990) by an additional 8 years.

Related work in adult education has examined individual journals, especially for content analysis (Blunt & Lee, 1994; Blunt, Lee, & Savarese, 1990; Dickinson & Rusnell, 1971; Hayes, 1992; Long & Agyekum, 1974; Rachal & Sargent, 1995a). As the Henthorne et al. (1998) work extended Barry (1990), the present work seeks to extend the baseline study of Rachal and Sargent (1995b) for an additional 10 years, thus providing a 20-year history from 1983-2002. That study surveyed the Commission of Professors of Adult Education to determine what that body considered to be the top five research journals in the field of adult education, constructed a point system based on authorship order, and examined each issue of each of the five journals for the 10-year period 1983-1992 to determine the institutional affiliation of all authors. Based on 158 responses to the 1993 survey, the top journals were determined to be, in rank order: *Adult Education Quarterly*, *Convergence*, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *Adult Literacy and Basic Education*, and *Lifelong Learning*. Examination of those five journals for the overall 10-year period resulted in an institutional productivity ranking in which Northern Illinois University ranked first, the University of British Columbia and the University of Georgia tied at second, Pennsylvania State University ranked fourth, and Rutgers University ranked fifth. The rankings were carried out to rank 36. Rachal and Sargent (1995b) also broke the 10-year period out into its two component 5-year periods to examine shifts in the two periods. They further separated the “adult education program score” from the “non-adult education program score” in order to assess the extent to which adult educators were collaborating with others who did not explicitly identify themselves with an adult education program. As it happened, the top 36 institutions for the 10-year period 1983-1992 and the top 40 institutions for each of the two 5-year periods were universities; no non-university programs were among the most productive 40 institutions.

Method

This study sought to replicate as much of the method of the 1995 study as seemed possible and desirable. There are four substantive differences. One primary methodological difference is that the breakout done in 1995 between “adult education program” points and “non-adult education program” points in the determination of an institution’s total points was not done here. Such distinctions were not always clear in examining affiliations, and further, one might speculate that graduate students co-authoring with faculty might often identify themselves with their employment rather than their student affiliation, thus clouding the distinction between “adult education program” and “non-adult education program.” A second primary difference is that the present

4 Rachal and David, "Institutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

study includes individual author publication productivity, which was not reported in the 1995 study but has been recommended by Barry (1990). Extending the individual author data, a third distinction is that gender data and collaboration of authors are also reported in the present study. A fourth distinction is that the present study examined and awarded points to all contributing institutions irrelevant of geography, whereas the earlier study examined only North American publication productivity and thus combined all institutions outside of Canada and the United States into a single category.

A hoped-for fifth addition to the 1995 study was a *per adult education faculty member* institutional ranking based on the number of full-time equivalent adult education faculty reported in Pierce's (1998) *Directory of Adult Education Graduate Programs in North America*. As Rachal and Sargent (1995b, p. 75) noted, "a per faculty member calculation would certainly alter the rankings, and some of the smaller programs would clearly be the beneficiaries." However, results yielded so many non-North American institutions that attempts to determine institutional faculty size in the mid-point year 1998 were abandoned. It should also be noted that the two studies had only three journals in common: *Adult Basic Education*, *Adult Education Quarterly*, and *International Journal of Lifelong Education*. The first study included, based on its survey of the professoriate, *Lifelong Learning and Convergence*, while the present study examined *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education* and *Studies in the Education of Adults*.

In keeping with the 1995 study, the present authors surveyed the Commission of Professors to determine the top five research journals in the field. Utilizing the Commission of Professors listserv, the researchers asked members to respond to a survey which listed in alphabetical order some 70 journals publishing adult education research. Members were asked "What five journals do you consider to be the top five primary research outlets for adult education researchers writing in English?" Once the top five journals were determined, each issue of these five journals was examined for the years 1993 through 2002 inclusive and the following information was recorded: year, volume, and issue number; institutional provenance(s); author(s); gender of author(s); and country of origin. Only full-length articles, essay reviews, and article-length Forum pieces were included; book reviews, editorials, replies, and responses, all of which had substantially fewer pages than the journal's typical articles, were excluded.

Points for both institutional and individual productivity based on authorship order closely followed the point allocation system from Rachal and Sargent (1995b): (a) one author/institution, 1.0 point; (b) two

authors/institutions, 0.6 point for first, 0.4 for second; (c) three authors/institutions—0.5, 0.3, 0.2; (d) four authors/institutions—0.4, 0.26, 0.19, 0.15; (e) five authors/institutions—0.37, 0.22, 0.18, 0.14, 0.09. For the five articles which had six or more authors, the point was divided equally among authors and their institutions. In this system, obviously, in a co-authored work each author received her/his fraction of the point, and if the authors were from the same institution, the institution received the full point; but if the authors' institutions were different, the institutions' point fractions were allocated according to author order. Also this allocation system insures that any particular author *position* receives less the more authors there are: a second author in a three-author article receives less (0.3 of a point) than a second author in a two-author work (0.4 of a point). All data were entered into an Excel spread sheet, and several checks and cross-references were conducted to insure accuracy. Various sorts were then conducted to do the following: (1) to rank institutions for the overall 10-year period; (2) to rank them for each of the 5-year periods; (3) to rank the top 10 institutions for each journal for the 10-year period; (4) to rank individual authors for the 10-year period; and (5) to provide descriptive data.

Results

The online survey of the adult education professoriate as determined by membership in the Commission of Professors of Adult Education yielded, after a second request for responses, a total of 27 replies. The top five research journals identified were *Adult Education Quarterly*, *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, *Adult Basic Education*, and *Studies in the Education of Adults* (see Table 1).

Table 1: CPAE Respondents' Top Five Journal Selections

Rank	Journal	Votes	% of respondents selecting
1	Adult Education Quarterly	24	88.8%
2	International Journal of Lifelong Education	14	51.8%
3	Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education	10	37.0%
4	Adult Basic Education	7	25.9%
5	Studies in the Education of Adults	7	25.9%
6	Journal of Continuing Higher Education	6	22.2%
7t	Convergence	5	18.5%
7t	Harvard Educational Review	5	18.5%

[table continues]

Table 1 (continued)

7t	Studies in Continuing Education	5	18.5%
10t	Australian Journal of Adult Learning	3	11.1%
10t	Human Resources Development Quarterly	3	11.1%
12t	American Journal of Distance Education	2	7.0%
12t	Canadian J. for University Continuing Education	2	7.0%
12t	Continuing Higher Education Review	2	7.0%
12t	Educational Gerontology	2	7.0%
12t	Journal of Educational Research	2	7.0%
12t	New Zealand Journal of Adult Learning	2	7.0%
12t	Adult Development (write-in)	2	7.0%

Notes: N=27; Percentages do not total 100% because respondents made multiple selections

Based on the institutional affiliation of authors of articles in these five journals for the period 1993-2002, the 10 most productive institutions are, in rank order: University of Georgia, Pennsylvania State University, University of British Columbia, University of Nottingham, University of Leeds, Griffith University, University of Alberta, Open University, University of Technology, and University of Warwick (see Table 2).

Table 2: 10-Year Journal Productivity by Institution, 1993-2002

Rank	Points*	Institution	Country	1983-1992 Rank**
1	31.13	University of Georgia	USA	3
2	27.60	Pennsylvania State University	USA	4
3	19.60	University of British Columbia	Canada	2
4	18.90	University of Nottingham	UK	-
5	16.70	University of Leeds	UK	-
6	16.30	Griffith University	Australia	-
7	15.80	University of Alberta	Canada	26
8	14.15	Open University	UK	-
9	13.06	University of Technology	Australia	-
10	11.35	University of Warwick	UK	-
11t	10.00	University of Montreal	Canada	25
11t	10.00	Literacy Volunteers	USA	-
11t	10.00	University of Glasgow	UK	-
14	9.50	University of Saskatchewan	Canada	-
15t	8.00	University of Surrey	UK	-
15t	8.00	University of St. Thomas	USA	-
17	7.98	University of Stirling	UK	-
18	7.60	Mount St. Vincent University	Canada	-
19	7.30	University of Ottawa	Canada	-
20t	7.00	University of Toronto	Canada	-

[table continues]

Table 2 (continued)

20t	7.00	University of Waikato	New Zealand	-
22t	6.60	Columbia University	USA	-
22t	6.60	University of Edinburgh	UK	-
22t	6.60	University of Wisconsin-Madison	USA	10
25t	6.15	University of Southern Mississippi	USA	9
25t	6.15	University of Britsol	UK	-
27	6.04	Cardiff University	UK	-
28t	6.00	University of Exeter	UK	-
28t	6.00	University of Malta	Malta	-
28t	6.00	University of Ulster	UK	-
31t	5.90	Northern Illinois University	USA	1
31t	5.40	University of Nebraska	USA	17
33t	5.40	St. Francis Xavier University	Canada	-
33t	5.40	Texas A&M University	USA	8
33t	5.40	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	USA	11
36	5.17	University of Botswana	Botswana	-
37t	5.00	University of Nijmegen	Netherlands	-
37t	5.00	University of Leiden	Netherlands	-
37t	5.00	University of Regina	Canada	-
40t	4.80	Ball State University	USA	36
40t	4.80	University of Hong Kong	China	-
42	4.60	City University of New York	USA	-
43	4.50	North Carolina State University	USA	-
44t	4.40	University of Huddersfield	UK	-
44t	4.40	University of Laval	Canada	-
44t	4.40	University of Southampton	UK	-
47	4.35	University of Melbourne	Australia	-
48t	4.00	Athabasca University	Canada	-
48t	4.00	City University London	UK	-
48t	4.00	Lakehead University	Canada	-
48t	4.00	Ohio State University	USA	12
48t	4.00	University of Hull	Canada	-
48t	4.00	University of Manitoba	Canada	-
48t	4.00	University of Maryland	USA	-
48t	4.00	University of Southern Australia	Australia	-

* Points rounded to the nearest hundredth.

** Thirteen of the 30 institutions from the Rachal and Sargent (1995) 1983–1992 study scored at least 4.4 points in that study and scored at least 4 points in the current 1993–2003 study. However, the 1983–1992 study did not list non-North American institutions individually.

When the 10-year period is divided into its component 5-year periods, University of Georgia, University of Nottingham, Pennsylvania State University, University of British Columbia, University of Leeds, Griffith University, University of Alberta, Open University and University of Wisconsin-Madison (tied at 8th), and University of Ulster comprise the top 10 in the 1993–1997 period (see Table 3).

8 Rachal and David, "Insitutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

Table 3: *Five-Year Journal Productivity by Institution, 1993-1997*

Rank	Points	Institution	Country
1	12.80	University of Georgia	USA
2	11.90	University of Nottingham	UK
3	10.00	Pennsylvania State University	USA
4t	9.40	University of British Columbia	Canada
4t	9.40	University of Leeds	UK
6	8.30	Griffith University	Australia
7	7.80	University of Alberta	Canada
8t	6.20	Open University	UK
8t	6.20	University of Wisconsin-Madison	USA
10	5.40	University of Ulster	UK
11t	5.00	Columbia University	USA
11t	5.00	University of Malta	Malta
11t	5.00	University of Montreal	Canada
11t	5.00	University of Warwick	UK
15	4.90	University of Nebraska	USA
16	4.50	University of Saskatchewan	Canada
17	4.30	University of Ottawa	Canada
18t	4.00	University of Hull	UK
18t	4.00	University of Leiden	Netherlands
18t	4.00	University of Manitoba	Canada
18t	4.00	University of Regina	Canada
18t	4.00	University of St. Thomas	USA
18t	4.00	University of Technology	Australia
18t	4.00	University of Waikato	New Zealand
25	3.80	Northern Illinois University	USA
26t	3.40	University of Laval	Canada
26t	3.00	University of Southampton	UK
28t	3.00	Athabasca University	Canada
28t	3.00	City University of New York	USA
28t	3.00	Ohio State University	USA
28t	3.00	University of Exeter	UK
28t	3.00	University of Glasgow	UK
28t	3.00	University of New England	Australia
28t	3.00	University of Southern Australia	Australia
28t	3.00	University of Trondheim	Norway

Note: Top 35 institutions ranked at 3 points or above.

For the 1998-2002 period, University of Georgia again takes the first spot with Pennsylvania State University second, followed by University of British Columbia, University of Technology, a three-way tie at 5th among Griffith University, Literacy Volunteers of America, and University of Alberta, with Open University, University of Leeds, and University of Stirling rounding out the top 10 (see Table 4).

Table 4: *Five-Year Journal Productivity by Institution, 1998-2002*

Rank	Points	Institution	Country
1	18.33	University of Georgia	USA
2	17.60	Pennsylvania State University	USA

[table continues]

Table 4 (continued)

3	10.20	University of British Columbia	Canada
4	9.06	University of Technology	Australia
5t	8.00	Griffith University	Australia
5t	8.00	Literacy Volunteers	USA
5t	8.00	University of Alberta	Canada
8	7.95	Open University	UK
9	7.30	University of Leeds	UK
10	7.08	University of Stirling	UK
11t	7.00	Mount St. Vincent University	Canada
11t	7.00	University of Glasgow	UK
11t	7.00	University of Nottingham	UK
14	6.35	University of Warwick	UK
15	6.04	Cardiff University	UK
16t	6.00	University of Surrey	UK
16t	6.00	University of Toronto	Canada
18	5.60	University of Edinburgh	UK
19	5.17	University of Botswana	Botswana
20	5.15	University of Bristol	UK
21t	5.00	Texas A&M University	USA
21t	5.00	University of Montreal	Canada
21t	5.00	University of Saskatchewan	Canada
24	4.60	St. Francis Xavier University	Canada
25	4.00	University of St. Thomas	USA
26t	3.40	University of Canterbury	UK
26t	3.40	Fordham University	USA
26t	3.40	University of Southern Mississippi	USA
26t	3.40	University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee	USA
30	3.35	University of Melbourne	Australia
31t	3.00	Hong Kong Polytechnic University	China
31t	3.00	I-Sho University	Taiwan
31t	3.00	Kansas State University	USA
31t	3.00	North Carolina State University	USA
31t	3.00	University of Exeter	UK
31t	3.00	University of Guelph	Canada
31t	3.00	University of Huddersfield	UK
31t	3.00	University of Ibadan	Nigeria
31t	3.00	University of Minnesota	USA
31t	3.00	University of Nijmegen	Netherlands
31t	3.00	University of Ottawa	Canada
31t	3.00	University of Waikato	New Zealand

Note: Top 42 institutions ranked at 3.0 points or above.

Institutional publication productivity was also broken out by each journal (see Table 5). *Adult Basic Education* published 107 or 13%¹ of the total

¹ All percentages in the narrative are rounded to the closest percentage point and thus may not total 100%.

10 Rachal and David, "Institutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

articles, and its top 10 were dominated by American institutions with Literacy Volunteers of America in the first position followed by Pennsylvania State University. *Adult Education Quarterly* published 117 articles (15%), with three countries among its top seven, and six ties at seventh place with three points each. University of Georgia dominated *AEQ*, with over twice the number of points as second-place Pennsylvania State University. The *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*, published twice per year, had a total of 97 articles (12%) and was dominated by Canadian universities, with University of Montreal and University of Toronto in the first and second positions. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, published six times per year, accounted for 317 articles, more than twice as many as any of the other journals, and 39% of the total of 806 articles. It had a diverse international representation, with five United Kingdom universities, two Australian universities, two American universities, and one Canadian in its top 10. University of Nottingham and Griffith University placed first and second. *Studies in the Education of Adults* also published articles from five different nations among its top nine. *Studies* published 140 articles (17%), with the Universities of Warwick and Leeds in its first two positions.

Table 5: Top Ten Institutions By Journal, 1993-2002

<i>Adult Basic Education—ABE</i>			107 Articles
Ranking	Institution	Country	Points
1	Literacy Volunteers of America	USA	8.00
2	Pennsylvania State University	USA	7.00
3	City University of New York	USA	4.60
4	University of Alberta	Canada	4.00
5	University of Wisconsin-Madison	USA	3.70
6	University of Georgia	USA	3.50
7	Fordham University	USA	3.40
8	Kansas State University	USA	3.00
9t	Ohio State University	USA	2.60
9t	St. Cloud State University	USA	2.60
<i>Adult Education Quarterly—AEQ</i>			145 Articles
Ranking	Institution	Country	Points
1	University of Georgia	USA	16.90
2	Pennsylvania State University	USA	6.00
3	University of Wisconsin-Wilwaukee	USA	5.40
4	University of Southern Mississippi	USA	4.40
5	Columbia University	USA	3.60
6	Ball State University	USA	3.40
7t	Antioch University	USA	3.00
7t	University of British Columbia	Canada	3.00

[table continues]

Table 5 (continued)

7t	University of Missouri	USA	3.00
7t	University of St. Thomas	USA	3.00
7t	University of Waikato	New Zealand	3.00
7t	University of Wisconsin-Madison	USA	3.00
<i>Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education</i>			<i>97 Articles</i>
Ranking	Institution	Country	Points
1	University of Montreal	Canada	8.40
2	University of Toronto	Canada	7.00
3	University of British Columbia	Canada	6.00
4	University of Saskatchewan	Canada	5.40
5t	University of Laval	Canada	4.40
5t	University of Alberta	Canada	4.40
7	Mount St. Vincent University	Canada	4.00
8	University of Ottawa	Canada	3.90
9t	University of Manitoba	Canada	3.00
9t	University of Quebec	Canada	3.00
<i>International Journal of Lifelong Education</i>			<i>317 Articles</i>
Ranking	Institution	Country	Points
1	University of Nottingham	UK	15.90
2	Giffith University	Australia	11.00
3	University of Georgia	USA	9.13
4	Pennsylvania State University	USA	8.60
5	University of Leeds	UK	8.30
6	Open University	UK	8.20
7	University of Glasgow	UK	8.00
8	University of Technology	Australia	7.40
9	University of British Columbia	Canada	7.20
10	University of Surrey	UK	6.00
<i>Studies in the Education of Adults</i>			<i>140 Articles</i>
Ranking	Institution	Country	Points
1	University of Warwick	UK	8.60
2	University of Leeds	UK	8.40
3	University of Southampton	UK	5.40
4	Open University	UK	4.75
5t	Pennsylvania State University	USA	4.00
5t	University of Leiden	Netherlands	4.00
5t	University of Regina	Canada	4.00
8	University of Technology	Australia	3.66
9	Cardiff University	UK	3.20
10t	Griffith University	Australia	3.00
10t	University of Alberta	Canada	3.00
10t	University of Edinburgh	UK	3.00
10t	University of Exeter	UK	3.00
10t	University of Nottingham	UK	3.00
10t	University of Ulster	UK	3.00
10t	University of Wales	UK	3.00

12 Rachal and David, "Institutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

The journals were also examined for individual author publication productivity. The 10 most prolific individual authors in these five journals for the 10-year period were George Demetrios, Richard Edwards, Michael Welton, Ronald Cervero, Stephen Brookfield, Edward Taylor, Tara Fenwick, Joyce Stalker, Pierre Walter, and Arthur Wilson (see Table 6).

Table 6: *Journal Productivity by Author, 1993-2002*

Rank	Points	Author	Institution/Agency	Country
1	10.00	George Demetrios	Literacy Volunteers of America	USA
2	7.95	Richard Edwards	University of Stirling	UK
3	7.60	Michael Welton	Mount St. Vincent University	Canada
4	7.58	Ronald Cervero	University of Georgia	USA
5	7.00	Stephen Brookfield	University of St. Thomas	USA
6	6.50	Edward Taylor	Pennsylvania State University	USA
7	6.20	Tara Fenwick	University of Alberta	Canada
8	6.00	Joyce Stalker	University of Waikato	NZ
9	5.40	Pierre Walter	University of British Columbia	Canada
10	5.30	Arthur Wilson	Cornell University	USA
11	5.00	Griff Foley	University of Technology	Australia
12	4.79	John Field	University of Warwick	UK
13	4.60	John Rachal	U. of Southern Mississippi	USA
14	4.40	Ralf St. Clair	Texas A&M University	USA
15	4.30	Baiyin Yang	University of Minnesota	USA
16	4.20	Elisabeth Hayes	University of Wisconsin	USA
17	4.10	Adrian Blunt	University of Saskatchewan	Canada
18t	4.00	Richard Bagnall	Griffith University	Australia
18t	4.00	Stephen Billett	Griffith University	Australia
18t	4.00	Jane Cruikshank	University of Regina	Canada
18t	4.00	Peter Mayo	University of Malta	Malta
18t	4.00	Jack Mezirow	Columbia University	USA
18t	4.00	Lyn Tett	University of Edinburgh	UK
24	3.60	Robin Usher	Institute of Technology	Australia
25	3.40	Ian Baptiste	Pennsylvania State University	USA
26t	3.20	Roseanne Benn	University of Exeter	UK
26t	3.20	Paul Godderham	University of Trondheim	Norway
26t	3.20	Allan Quigley	St. Francis Xavier University	Canada
26t	3.20	Tom Steele	Glasgow University	UK
30	3.13	Sharan Merriam	University of Georgia	USA
31t	3.00	Andre Grace	University of Alberta	Canada
31t	3.00	Colin Griffin	University of Surrey	UK
31t	3.00	Barry Hake	University of Leiden	Netherlands
31t	3.00	Chrisine Jarvis	University of Huddersfield	UK
31t	3.00	Kathleen King	Fordham University	USA
31t	3.00	Jindra Kulich	Unaffiliated	Canada
31t	3.00	Hui-Fang Shang	I-Shou University	China
31t	3.00	Barbara Sparks	North Carolina State University	USA
31t	3.00	Maurice Taylor	University of Ottawa	Canada
31t	3.00	Richard Taylor	University of Leeds	UK
31t	3.00	Elizabeth Tisdell	National-Louis University	USA

The study also examined certain descriptive data concerning single authorship versus lead authorship, both by gender and by individual journal (see Table 7). There were a total of 806 articles published in the five journals over 10 years, and there were 1214 cumulative authors (481 female, or 40%; 676 male, or 56%; and 57 of unknown gender, or 5%). "Cumulative authors" refers to the total number of names appearing on the 806 articles, meaning that a single individual contributing to several articles would count multiple times. By contrast, there were 827 separate individuals (372 females, or 45%; 404 males, or 49%; and 51 of unknown gender, or 6%) contributing to the 806 articles. "Separate individuals" means that irrelevant of how many articles a person contributed to, his or her name was counted only once. Geographically, there were 1214 cumulative institutions to match the 1214 cumulative authors, of which 406 (33%) were from the U.S., 300 (25%) were from the U.K., 206 (17%) were from Canada, 102 (8%) were from Australia, and 200 (16%) were from other nations. Institutionally, there were 299 separate colleges and universities and 57 other organizations or institutions contributing to the 806 articles. Lastly, there were 525 articles (65%) written by a single author, 197 (24%) written by two authors, 57 (7 %) written by three authors, 20 (2%) written by four, two written by five, four written by six, and one written by 10.

Table 7: *Authorship and Gender, by Journal*

Category	ABE	AEQ	CJSAE	IJLLE	SEA	Total
Total Articles	107	145	97	317	140	806
Male Solo	35	44	39	137	56	311
Female Solo	32	33	28	62	42	197
Unknown Solo Gender	1	5	1	9	1	17
Male Lead	18	35	10	66	21	150
Female Lead	21	28	19	38	19	125
Unknown Lead Gender	0	0	0	5	1	6
Total Male Authors Solo and Lead	53	79	49	203	77	461
Total Female Authors Solo and Lead	53	61	47	100	61	322
Total Unknown Gender Authors Solo and Lead	1	5	1	14	2	23

Discussion

Perhaps the most salient observation to be drawn from even the briefest examination of the tables is the far more international flavor of the 1993-2002 data as compared to the 1983-1992 data. Every one of the 36 institutions ranked in the 1983-1992 period was North American—31 U.S. institutions, five Canadian. This was inevitable since the earlier study combined all *non-*

North American institutions into a single category, which prohibited an individual listing of their productivity. Nevertheless, by contrast, only 19 of the top 36 from the 1993-2002 period were North American—11 U.S., 8 Canadian. Indeed, only three American institutions are in the top 10 for 1993-2002, though 2 of them are the top 2. Four American institutions are in the top 20, and 7 are in the top 30. Among Canadian institutions, 2 are in the top 10 and 7 are in the top 20, with no more until rank 33. The broad internationalism of the data reflects the fact that 31% of the total articles were from the two American journals, *Adult Basic Education* and *Adult Education Quarterly*; 56% were from the two British journals, *International Journal of Lifelong Education* and *Studies in the Education of Adults*; and 12% were from the *Canadian Journal for the Study of Adult Education*.

Of course the determination of which journals to include is critical. Using the CPAE listserv clearly yields an American bias, but the actual journal selections themselves seem both reasonable and non-provincial. The far lower number of 27 respondents to the current study, as compared to 158 in the earlier study, was disappointing, and the numbers were sufficiently low that only one vote separates the fifth place British *Studies in the Education of Adults* from the sixth place American *Journal of Continuing Higher Education*. Happily, the top five journals all deal exclusively with adult education, as opposed to, for example, *Harvard Educational Review*, which tied for seventh in the journal rankings; and they all focus more on research-based articles, unlike, for example, some of the descriptive or hortatory articles contained in the now defunct *Lifelong Learning* selected in the 1995 study. The significantly lower response rate of the current study may be attributable to utilizing email as its survey method, with its name identification and its possibly greater "ignorability" given the sheer quantity of email the average professor receives daily.

There was moderate stability at least among the top 10 when one breaks out the 1993-2002 period into its two 5-year periods. Seven of the top 10 institutions in the 1993-1997 period were also in the top 10 for the 1998-2002 period. Conversely, seven from the 1998-2002 period were also in the top 10 of the 1993-1997 period. However, a few institutions do well in the earlier period but not in later one, such as 8th place University of Wisconsin-Madison, 10th place University of Ulster, and 11th places University of Malta and Columbia University (tied), none of which makes the 3-point cut-off in the later period. The reverse was also true: 5th place Literacy Volunteers of America, 10th place University of Stirling, and 11th place Mount St. Vincent University in the later period did not make the three-point

cut-off in the earlier period. Still, the shifts and “no shows” in one period may not be all that dramatic in view of the fact that tenth place was only 5.4 points in the first period and only 7.08 points in the second, so to drop below three points in 1998-2002 is not necessarily a precipitous falling off, nor is a gain from just under 3 points in 1993-1997 to 7 or 8 points in 1998-2002 a dizzying rise.

Literacy Volunteers of America, the only institution that was not a university among the top 48 for the overall period, illustrates a couple of interesting points. First is the influence of a single individual: All of LVA’s 10 points came from one individual who single-authored two articles in 1993-1997 and eight articles in 1998-2002. This very high productivity yielded the author, George Demetron, first place among authors and yielded LVA 10th place overall. Several other institutions owe their productivity to one or two authors, a phenomenon quite understandable in a field where programs are typically small. In fact, shifts from one period to the next should be viewed in light of size of the program, and especially the possibility of prolific individuals moving, retiring, or changing career direction. LVA also illustrates a point about the focus versus breadth issue. Given LVA’s mission, it is not surprising that 8 of its 10 points were in a single journal, *Adult Basic Education*, a journal focused on literacy-related issues. By contrast, however, Pennsylvania State University scored in the top 10 of four of the journals, and University of Georgia, University of British Columbia, and University of Alberta scored in the top 10 of three journals.

The top 15 individual authors were a nice cross-section of the international scene of adult education researchers writing in English—eight American, three Canadian, two British, and one each from Australia and New Zealand. Given that 56% of the articles appear in the two British journals, it is surprising that only two authors from the U.K. are in the top 15. Two of the top four authors illustrate two opposite tendencies, one towards single authorship (Demetron, with 10 points in 10 articles), and the other towards wide collaboration (Cervero, with 7.58 points but distributed among a remarkable 20 different articles). A possible inference is that Demetron works in a setting more oriented toward practice than research, and thus he has fewer colleagues interested in conducting research. However, simple personal disposition may also account for the tendency toward either single authorship or collaboration; Brookfield’s fifth-place 7 points are also all from single authorship. By contrast, Cervero’s high productivity may result partially from an interest in mentoring students in the process not only of research but also of publication.

Collaboration patterns are interesting in themselves. Rachal and Sargent (1995b) found that "collaboration is not the norm in adult education research," with 76% of their articles written by single authors, 20% by two authors, and only 4% by three or more. The present data reveal a modest shift toward greater collaboration, with 65% by single authors, 24% by two authors, and 10% by three or more. Nor did single authorship patterns dramatically differ by journal: *Adult Education Quarterly* had the lowest single authorship percentage at 53%, while *Studies in the Education of Adults* had the highest at 70%. For comparison, Rachal and Sargent (1995b) noted that, as of the early 1990s, several psychology journals had less than 20% single-authored articles, whereas a recent scan of three years of *PMLA*, the premiere research journal in English literature, showed almost the exact opposite: 85% single authorship. Adult education may occupy a middle ground between the liberal arts, where single authorship is the clear norm, and a more empirically-based field like psychology, where multiple authorship is expected. Nevertheless, the preponderance of single authorship in adult education—though diminishing since the 1983-1992 study—seems to run counter to the publish or perish orientation of most research universities, in which the tendency of tenure and promotion committees to count "lines on the vita" weighs heavily in tenure and promotion decisions. For that reason, if for no other, younger, tenure- and promotion-seeking professors in particular might seek collaboration opportunities.

Looking at single authorship versus collaboration from the perspective of gender, males had a marginally greater propensity for single authorship than females relative to their total numbers. Males were 56% of the cumulative 1214 authors, and 59% of the single-authored works were by them; females were just under 40% of the 1214 cumulative authors (with 4% of unknown gender), and 38% of the single-authored works were by them (single authors of unknown gender accounted for the other 3%). Looking at *lead* authorship, there is a slight reversal: among articles with more than a single author, men were lead author on 150 or 53% of all collaborations, down 3% from their cumulative numbers; women were lead author on 125 or 44% of all collaborations, up 4% relative to their cumulative numbers. In short, there are very minor differences between females and males in terms of their tendency to single author, and in their tendency to be the lead author when they collaborate. Finally, when lead author men collaborate with one other colleague, they tend to do so with other men 52% of the time and with women 45% of the time, with 4% unknown; and when lead author women collaborate, they also tend to do so with men 52% of the time and with other women 44% of the time. Thus lead author women have a slightly higher

tendency toward opposite-gender collaborations than men do, or, obversely, lead author men have a slightly higher tendency toward same-gender collaborations than women do.

Because Rachal and Sargent (1995b) did not examine institutions outside of the U.S. and Canada individually, a comparison of the two periods 1983-1992 and 1993-2002 that is fair to those non-North American institutions cannot be made. However, if one examines *only* North American institutions, and if one accepts the fact that the two studies held only three journals in common, then institutional points from the two studies may be aggregated to reveal a 20-year, U.S.-Canada portrait in which University of Georgia, Pennsylvania State University, University of British Columbia, Northern Illinois University, University of Montreal, Columbia University, University of Alberta, Rutgers University, University of Wisconsin-Madison, and University of Southern Mississippi comprise the top 10. Such a combination, it should be repeated, is tenable only for the U.S. and Canada, as it ignores the high productivity in 1993-2002 of such non-North American institutions as University of Nottingham, University of Leeds, and others which may have also done well in the earlier period, but the absence of that data precludes a true international 20-year continuum. In short, a true international comparison of the combined periods would almost certainly yield a different ranking, including a different top 10.

Conclusion

As noted by several authors, journal publication productivity is a fairly common means of examining research productivity within a field. The present study sought to extend Rachal and Sargent's (1995b) adult education data for an additional 10 years, and to an extent that was possible. What can be said with certitude is that the top institutions and the top individuals of the last 10 years contribute significantly to the journal literature of adult education. Further, University of Georgia, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of British Columbia have demonstrably done so for 20 years, while University of Nottingham, University of Leeds, Griffith University, and Open University are likely to have done so but an absence of complete data from the first 10 years prevents their accomplishments being demonstrable. Equally true is the fact that large programs have an advantage in such studies, and it is at least possible that smaller programs might be more productive than some larger ones utilizing a publications-per-faculty-member assessment.

As recommended by Rachal and Sargent (1995b), the present study examined collaboration patterns, and it further examined publication

productivity both by individual authors and by gender, neither of which the earlier study attempted. There is still research to be done examining such issues as other forms of research productivity, possible connections between research productivity and teaching excellence, and decision patterns of graduate students in program selection. Also remaining is the interesting and related question of examining content trends in these journals to determine what themes are emerging, persisting, or receding, and which paradigms are flourishing and which are waning. While journal publication productivity may well be of interest to administrators and prospective graduate students, perhaps its most interested constituency is the researchers themselves. Publication productivity analyses are, after all, what Liebowitz and Palmer (1984, cited by Barry, 1990, p. 52) refer to in their own productivity analysis as an "enjoyable form of navel-gazing for those within a given discipline." But beyond that, as Barry (1990, p. 53), summarizing others, notes, "productivity analyses of academic journals help to codify the contributions of a discipline, to illustrate that discipline's maturation, and to provide for the evaluation and setting of standards for scholarly output" (Heck & Cooley, 1988); they "can sharpen the output of both the scholars and the discipline as a whole" (Cole & Bowers, 1973); and they can serve as "an appropriate surrogate for the 'currentness' of a department's faculty" (Clark, 1986). As adult education as a field of academic inquiry comes of age, such analyses may serve just such purposes as well as become milestone markers allowing reflection on the field's maturation.

References

- Assessing faculty publication productivity: Issues of equity [report title]. (1998, June 12). *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, p. A12.
- Barry, T. E. (1990). Publication productivity in the three leading U.S. advertising journals: Inaugural issues through 1988. *Journal of Advertising*, 19, 52-60.
- Blunt, A., & Lee, J. (1994). The contribution of graduate student research to *Adult Education/Adult Education Quarterly*, 1969-1988. *Adult Education Quarterly*, 44, 125-144.
- Blunt, A., Lee, J., & Savarese, F. (1990). The contribution of graduate student research published in *The Journal of Adult Education [sic]/Adult Education Quarterly*, 1969-1988. Salt Lake City: American Association for Adult and Continuing Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 336 645)
- Brems, C. & Johnson, M. E. (1996). Publication productivity of clinical and counseling psychologists. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 52, 723-726.

- Clark, G. L. (1986). Leading marketing departments in the United States: Who is publishing where, and how much are they publishing? American Marketing Association, Chicago Conference, *AMA Educators' Proceedings*, pp. 149-153.
- Cole, R. R. & Bowers, T. A. (1973). Research article productivity of U. S. journalism faculties. *Journalism Quarterly*, 50, 246-254.
- Cox, W. M., & Catt, V. (1977). Productivity ratings of graduate programs in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 32, 793-813.
- Dickinson, G., & Rusnell, D. (1971). A content analysis of *Adult Education*. *Adult Education*, 21, 177-185.
- Ellman, I. M. (1983). A comparison of law faculty production in leading law reviews. *Journal of Legal Education*, 33, 681-692.
- Hayes, E. (1992). The impact of feminism on adult education publications: An analysis of British and American journals. *International Journal of Lifelong Education*, 11, 125-138.
- Heck, J. L. & Cooley, P. L. (1988). Most frequent contributors to the finance literature. *Financial Management*, 17, 100-108.
- Henthorne, T. L., LaTour, M. S., & Loraas, T. (1998). Publication productivity in the three leading U.S. advertising journals: 1989-1996. *Journal of Advertising*, 27, 53-63.
- Hopkins, C. J. (1979). Productivity ratings of institutions based on publication in reading journals: 1972-1978. *Journal of Reading Behavior*, 11, 171-181.
- Howard, G. S. (1983). Research productivity in counseling psychology: An update and generalization study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 30, 600-602.
- Howard, G. S., Cole, D. A., & Maxwell, S. E. (1987). Research productivity in psychology based on publication in the journals of the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 42, 975-986.
- Howard, G. S., Maxwell, S. E., Berra, S. M., & Sternitzke, M. E. (1985). Institutional research productivity in industrial/organizational psychology. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 233-236.
- Johns, J. L. (1983). *A study of institutional productivity in "Reading World": 1978-1993*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois University. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 248 490)
- Liddle, B. J. & Westergren, A. J. (1997). Time allocation and research productivity among counseling faculty. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 339-345.
- Liebowitz, S. J. & Palmer, J. P. (1984). Assessing the relative impacts of economics journals. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 22, 77-78.
- Long, H. B., & Agyekum, S. K. (1974). *Adult Education 1964-1973: Reflections of a changing discipline*. *Adult Education*, 24, 99-120.
- Pierce, W. L. (1998). *Directory of adult education graduate programs in North America*. Hattiesburg, MS: University of Southern Mississippi.

20 Rachal and David, "Institutional and Individual Publication Productivity"

- Rachal, J. R. & Sargent, S. F. (1995a). Institutional publication productivity and content trends in *Adult Literacy and Basic Education/Adult Basic Education, 1983-1992. Adult Basic Education, 5*, 14-27.
- Rachal, J. R. & Sargent, S. F. (1995b). Publication productivity of North American institutions in selected adult education journals, 1983-1992. *Adult Education Quarterly, 45*, 63-78.
- Reynolds, C. R., & Clark, J. H. (1984). Trends in school psychology research: 1974-1980. *Journal of School Psychology, 22*, 43-52.
- Teodorescu, D. (2000). Correlates of faculty publication productivity: A cross-national analysis. *Higher Education, 39*, 201-223.
- Webster, R. E., Hall, C. W., & Bolen, L. M. (1993). Publication productivity in selected school psychology journals: 1985-1991. *Psychology in the Schools, 30*, 136-142.